

---

# 6A

## Action

### *Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee of the Whole*

#### **Approval of Agreements that Exceed One Hundred Thousand Dollars**

---

**Executive Summary:** Section 610 of the CCTC Policy Manual (Contract Authority) requires that agreements or contracts of \$100,000 or more be approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. This item presents an agreement that requires approval.

**Recommended Action:** Staff seeks the approval for the Interim Executive Director or designee to execute the agreement as presented in this agenda item.

**Presenter:** Crista Hill, Division Director, Fiscal and Business Services Section

#### **Strategic Plan Goal: 4**

**Continue effective and appropriate involvement of the Commission with policymakers on key education issues.**

- Respond to policymakers information inquiries.
- Collaborate with and advise appropriate agencies.

November-December 2006



---

## Approval of Agreements that Exceed One Hundred Thousand Dollars

---

### Introduction

Section 610 of the CCTC Policy Manual (Contract Authority) requires that agreements or contracts of \$100,000 or more be approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission). This agenda item seeks the approval for the Interim Executive Director or designee to authorize the agreement as presented in this agenda item that are in excess of \$100,000.

### Background

Section 610 of the CCTC Policy Manual (Contract Authority) requires that agreements of \$100,000 or more be approved by the Commission. If approved, the Interim Executive Director or designee has the authority to approve the agreement (s) for the purpose intended.

### Agreement Type

### Examination

Commission staff seeks the approval for the Interim Executive Director or designee to approve the contract for the *administration only* of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET), and Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) examinations for a three-year period (testing years 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10) ending October 31, 2010. As noted in the Request for Proposal (RFP) there is the possibility of two (2) one-year extensions, as needed. The successful proposal was determined based on the proposal that earned the highest total number of points by the review team.

*It is important to note that the contractor being recommended for the award will be formally announced on the evening of November 20, 2006. Formal notification will be available on the Commission's website at [www.ctc.ca.gov](http://www.ctc.ca.gov) or at the Commission Office at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814-4213 at the appropriate time. As a result, an agenda insert will be provided at the November 30-December 1, 2006 meeting for this item.*

### Proposal Review Process

Potential bidders for this contract were instructed to respond to the advertised RFP, *Request for Proposals for the Administration of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET), and Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)*. This RFP was approved at the May 31-June 1, 2006 Commission meeting and released on August 18, 2006. Two contractors responded to this RFP.

The following outlines the procedures used to evaluate these bids. These procedures adhere to the State Contracting Manual and Commission policies, and reflect the discussion that the Commissioners held with Ms. Cynthia Curry, legal counsel for the Department of General Services – Office of Legal Services at the May 31-June 1, 2006 meeting. These are also the same procedures as noted in the RFP.

## **Stages of Review and Evaluation**

There were two stages to the proposal review and evaluation process. The first was to determine if each proposal met the criteria specified in the *Evaluation Criteria Part I: Compliance with Proposal Eligibility Requirements*, as listed on pages 44 and 45 of the RFP. These criteria include such items as submission of the 10 numbered copies of the bid by the established deadline, inclusion of a table of contents, and coverage of all required criteria. Two members of the Examinations and Research Unit of the Professional Services Division performed this initial evaluation on October 6, 2006, and found that both proposals complied.

The second stage of the evaluation process was to review the bids against the *Evaluation Criteria Part II: Compliance with Proposal Program Requirements*, found on pages 46 and 47 of the RFP. Eight (8) individuals on the Commission staff, representing the Department of Professional Practices, the Office of Governmental Relations, and the Professional Services Division, performed this work. This review team reflected extensive experience in standardized testing, examinee needs, test security, and managerial skills.

The review team initially met on October 10, 2006, for an orientation session. The session covered the content described in the RFP, including each scorable criterion: the test administration processes, corporate capability, management and staffing plan, cost detail and financial arrangements, and overall presentation. Also discussed were the scoring rubrics and the Proposal Review Documentation Form that reviewers were to use for notes about the criteria and for recording their initial scores. During the orientation, it was stressed that each bid should be judged based on its response to the criteria listed in the RFP and not as a comparison with the other bid. It was also stressed that the reviewers must act independently and could not discuss the merits of the bids until they met for the final review session.

The review team reassembled on November 2, 2006, for the final review session, and, as a group, discussed each proposal separately. For the first proposal, the individuals' initial scores for each area were listed on a chalkboard and were briefly reviewed. Then the overall character of the proposal was discussed, noting general trends, highlights, and concerns. This was followed by an in-depth discussion of each criterion and, based on this discussion, the reviewers could revise their initial criteria scores. The reviewers also noted any issue that they felt the bidder needed to clarify prior to the possible awarding of the contract. The reviewers' final scores were then totaled, and the average was calculated. This same process was then repeated for the second proposal.

The review team members were asked if the bidders' responses to their questions would change their scores significantly, potentially resulting in a change in the recommendation. The reviewers did not feel that this was the case. The panel members were also asked if they felt that the differences in the average total scores accurately reflected their analysis of the proposals, and the response was unanimously in the affirmative.

Following the review team meeting, the score points for the cost price criteria were applied according to the published score point process. A final score for each was then established, which further broadened the differences in the average total scores.

## **Recommendation**

Commission staff seeks the approval for the Interim Executive Director or designee to execute the agreement as presented in the agenda item and related insert.